APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/405,731	09/24/1999	THOMAS L. DISTEFANO III	6676.5	9812

7590   10/08/2002

QUARLES & BRADY LLP
222 LAKEVIEW AVENUE SUITE 400
P O BOX 3188
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 334023188

EXAMINER
GRAHAM, CLEMENT B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/405,731	DISTEFANO III, THOMAS L.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Clement B Graham	3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the c rresp ndence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 July 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant 's arguments filed on 07/16/2002 are moot in view of the new grounds of rejections

Specification

2.   Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes, Inventive Method, Comprise" ect.

Abstract – should not have the word means and "invention" "disclosed".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1, 3, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

[anticipated] by Schneck U.S. Patent No.6,314,409.

Claim 1, Schneck et al discloses a method for controlling access to data, and

users are provided access to data only in accordance with the rules as enforced by the

mechanism protected by tamper detection and preventing access to the protected portions

of data and determining rules concerning access rights to data and means for accessing

the protected data portions only in accordance with the rules whereby user access to

protected data is permitted only if the rules indicate that the user is allowed to access the

portions of the data. (Note abstract and column 7 lines 15-45).

As per claims 3 and 13, Schneck et al discloses if payment is determined to be

acceptable then it is determined whether or not the rules apply any restrictions on the data

for example whether or not the rules to restrict the data then the restriction is enforced

and the I/O is performed based on the restriction otherwise the I/O is performed without

restriction. (See column 20 lines 35-40 and column 37 line 40 and column 8 line 40-45).

Schneck et al also discloses a method for controlling access to data, and users are provided

access to data only in accordance with the rules as enforced by the mechanism protected by

tamper detection and preventing access to the protected portions of data and determining rules

concerning access rights to data and means for accessing the protected data portions only in

accordance with the rules whereby user access to protected data is permitted only if the rules

indicate that the user is allowed to access the portions of the data. (Note abstract and column 7

lines 15-45).

As per claim 11, Schneck et al discloses a method for controlling access to data,

and users are provided access to data only in accordance with the rules as enforced by the

mechanism protected by tamper detection and preventing access to the protected portions

of data and determining rules concerning access rights to data and means for accessing

the protected data portions only in accordance with the rules whereby user access to

protected data is permitted only if the rules indicate that the user is allowed to access the

portions of the data. (Note abstract and column 7 lines 15-45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patent ability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claim 2, 4-5, 12, 14-15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Schneck et al US Patent 6,314,409. in view of Levin et al US Patent 5,432,934.

As per claims 2 and 12,   the teachings of Schneck et al are discussed above. Schneck

et al does not explicitly teach first disabling all document saving functionality or second

disabling all document coping functionality or third disabling all document downloading

functionality or access to the system subsequent to first and second disabling steps this is taught

by Levin et al. Levin et al discloses the operating system environment and the application

program are arranged so that the user interface for each different user type is initially fully enable

for that type of user provides means, in the form of an access restriction system, to disable

selected interface features for each different types of users and by selectively disabling interface

features.(See column 2 lines 30-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Schneck et al to include

Levine et al in order to perform the disable and enable functionalities. The benefit would have

been to have the capability of these functionalities in place in event a restriction to a user should

apply and preventing the user from performing these functions.

As per claims 4 and 14, the teachings of Schneck et al are discussed above. Accepting credit card information and submitting credit card information to authorization system and retrieving authorization from the authorization system is common in the art. The motivation for accepting and retrieving authorization in the combination of Schneck et al and Levin et al would have been to process a user credit card for payment of goods or services and completing the process by receiving payment authorization. The benefit would have been for a company to receive payment for goods or services rendered after processing a credit card information.

As per claim 5 and 15, the teachings of Schneck et al are discussed above. Schneck et al does not explicitly teach first disabling all document saving functionality or second disabling all document coping functionality or third disabling all document downloading functionality or access to the system subsequent to first and second disabling steps this is taught by Levin et al. Levin et al discloses the operating system environment and the application program are arranged so that the user interface for each different user type is initially fully enable for that type of user provides means, in the form of an access restriction system, to disable selected interface features for each different type of user and by selectively disabling interface features.(See column 2 lines 30-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Schneck et al to include Levin et al in order to perform the disable and enable functionalities. The benefit would have been to have the capability of these functionalities in place in event a restriction to a user should apply and preventing the user from performing these functions.

5.   Claims 6-10, 13 and 16-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneck et al US Patent 6,314,409. in view of Nakai et al US Patent 6,170,016.

As per claims 6-7 and 16-17, the teachings of Schneck et al are discussed above.

Schneck et al does not explicitly teach accepting a request from a user for a unique URL or

registering a unique URL on the behalf of the user and associating the URL with a web site

commissioned by registered user and posted for the internet this was taught by Nakai et al.

Nakai et al discloses a browser that has a function for accepting registration of URL a unique

address of web page before hand cyclically gets access to web servers holding web pages of

registered URL (the phrase to get access to web servers holding web pages of the registered URL

is expressed as to get access URL simply obtaining the contents of web pages. Nakai et al also

discloses that a web page of the registered URL content periodically update a cache memory

implemented by software using existing memory rather than a memory specialized for browser

which is provided in a computer on the client side of the web browser used for storing the

registered URL content. (See column 1 lines 15-50 and cloumn6 line 10). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

teachings of Schneck et al to include Nakai et al in order to be able to accept a user request for a

URL and registering the unique URL on the behalf of the user and linking the URL to web site to

provide Internet viewing. The benefit would have been having a variety of web pages containing

documents functional and available for viewing on the Internet.

As per claims 8 and 18, the teachings of Schneck et al are discussed above. Schneck et

al does not explicitly teach accepting electronic submission of web assets from third party or

storing accepted Web assets in a database or compensating third party for subsequent distribution

of web assets this is taught by Nakai et al. Nakai et al discloses in order to periodically update a

cache memory implemented by software using an existing memory rather than a memory

specialized for the browser which is provided in a computer on a client side of the Web browser

Used for storing the registered URL content. (See column 2 lines 40-55 and column 6 lines 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to modify the teachings of Schneck et al to include Nakai et al in order to accept a user request

for a URL and a means for storing the URL. The benefit would have been for easy retrieval of

the stored URL content from storage for viewing benefiting the customers.

As per claims 9 and 19, the teachings of Schneck et al are discussed above. Schneck et

al does not explicitly teach permitting an upload of web assets from third party or screening a

said uploaded web assets for markets or accepting screen uploaded web assets for distribution.

This is taught by Nakai et al. Nakai et al discloses in Web server which holds and transmits the

Web page, the request accepting means accepts a URL indicating either one of the Web pages as

information indicating the transmission data which the Web server requested. (See column 2

lines 40-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the teachings of Schneck et al to include Nakai et al in order for a

system equipped with the uploading functionalities to perform these functions. The benefit

would have been to have the capability of these functionalities in place in to allow a user to use

these function providing a smooth operating system for the benefit of a company.

As per claim 10 and 20, the teachings of Schneck et al are discussed above.

Compensating an author for the use of forming a web page and crediting the authors account in

return for the use of the web page is common practice in the art. The motivation would have

been to pay an author for his work of forming a web page and the use of it. The benefit

would have been to have a system with a variety of web pages consisting of different documents

to be access creating a financial benefit for accompany.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicants

disclosure.

Amstein(US 5,793,966 Patent) teaches a computer system and computer

implemented process for creation and maintenance of online services.

Gardner(US 5,758,327 Patent) teaches a electronic requistion and authorization

process.

Hoffman (US Patent 5,615,277) teaches a tokenless security system for

authorization access to a secured computer system .

Cornelia (US Patent No 6,065,026) teaches multi user electronic docment

authorizing system with prompted updating of shared language.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Clement Graham, whose telephone number is (703) 305-

1874. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM

to 5:00 PM. The fax phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 305-0040.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should

be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number

is (703) 305-3900.

FRANTZY POINVIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
AU 3628